



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

109
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/856,374	05/21/2001	Ryuichi Morishita	Q64360	8301

7590 10/28/2004

Sughrue Mion Zinn Macpeak & Seas
2100 Pennsylvania Avenue N W
Washington, DC 20037-3213

EXAMINER

LI, QIAN JANICE

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1632

DATE MAILED: 10/28/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKETT NO.
09/856,374	5/21/01	Morishita et al	964360

EXAMINER

G. Janice Li

ART UNIT

1632

PAPER NUMBER

10/13/04

DATE MAILED:

EXAMINER INTERVIEW SUMMARY RECORD

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) G. Janice Li, PTO

(3) Susan J Mack, Appl. Rep.

(2) Amy Nelson, PTO

(4) Lisa Stahl "

Date of interview 10/13/04

Type: Telephonic Personal (copy is given to applicant applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: Yes No. If yes, brief description: Yonemitsu et al

Agreement was reached with respect to some or all of the claims in question. was not reached.

Claims discussed: 13-17

Identification of prior art discussed: Yonemitsu et al stated the conventional HVJ-liposome has low efficiency in gene delivery.

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's rep. indicated the cited Yonemitsu reference stated the low efficiency of HVJ-liposome used by applicants. and the unpredictability of gene therapy would not predictably reach the integrity claimed invention. The examiners indicated the art of record

also show that local delivery of therapeutic gene to brain would function to certain degree. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph below has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW (e.g., items 1-7 on the reverse side of this form). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, then applicant is given one month from this interview date to provide a statement of the substance of the interview.

2. Since the examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the substance of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

Examiner's Signature